UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,328	08/15/2001	Steven French	AUS920010290US1	1697

7590 10/11/2005

Joseph R. Burwell
Law Office Of Joseph R. Burwell
P.O. Box 28022
Austin, TX 78755-8022

EXAMINER	
POPHAM, JEFFREY D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2137	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,328	FRENCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,18-31 and 35-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,18-31 and 35-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20010815*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 1-14, 18-31, and 35-37 are pending.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 8 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

   - Claim 8 refers to "the endpoint resource" and "the generated unique name", neither of which are used in claim 1. The examiner believes that claim 8 should be dependent upon claim 4, as opposed to claim 1.
   - Claim 25 refers to "the endpoint resource" and "the generated unique name", neither of which are used in claim 18. The examiner believes that claim 25 should be dependent upon claim 21, as opposed to claim 18.

   Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14, 18-31, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (U.S. Patent 6,732,176) in view of Moore (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0047407).

Regarding Claim 1,

Stewart discloses a method for management of a distributed data processing system, comprising:

Determining a unique hardware identifier for a network device (Column 10, lines 38-52);

Associating the unique hardware identifier with geographic location information (Column 10, lines 38-52; and Column 11, lines 17-53); and

Configuring the network device in accordance with the geographic location information (Column 11, lines 28-53), but does not disclose that this is done through a network administrative user interface.

Moore, however, discloses configuring a network device in accordance with the geographical location information through a network administrative user interface (Page 14, Paragraph 275). It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the physical location determination system of Moore into the distributed communications system of Stewart in order to provide reliability in the geographic location information by using the maximum number of location determination mechanisms that are allowed in a particular computer or network.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 35,

Claim 35 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Stewart discloses that the unique network hardware identifier is a MAC (Media Access Control) address (Column 10, lines 53-63).

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 36,

Claim 36 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Stewart discloses authorizing user access to the network device based on a user security parameter corresponding to the geographic location information (Column 11, lines 28-53).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 37,

Claim 37 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Stewart discloses generating a unique name for an endpoint resource on the network device, wherein the unique name comprises the geographic location information (Column 8, lines 17-34).

Regarding Claim 21,

Claim 21 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Stewart discloses associating the unique name with security attributes for the endpoint resource (Column 16, lines 38-55), and Moore discloses associating the unique name with security attributes for the endpoint resource (Page 9, Paragraph 114).

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Stewart discloses associating the unique name for the endpoint

resource with the unique network hardware identifier (Column 10, lines 38-52; and Column 11, lines 17-53).

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 7,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Stewart discloses determining a router close to the endpoint resource (Column 5, lines 55-62);

Retrieving router geographic location information associated with the router (Column 8, lines 17-34); and

Using the router geographic location information in the generated unique name for the endpoint resource (Column 8, lines 17-34).

Moore discloses determining the router closest to the endpoint resource (Page 3, Paragraph 39).

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Moore discloses determining a network address generator (NAG) for the endpoint resource (Page 6, Paragraphs 63-66);

Retrieving NAG geographic location information associated with the NAG (Page 16, Paragraphs 293-294); and

Stewart discloses using geographic location information (from the access point/router) in the generated unique name for the endpoint resource (Column 8, lines 17-34). The geographic location information sent from the DHCP server in Moore relates to the geographic information sent from the access point in Stewart. In other words, the DHCP server is viewed as being another access point, with the additional functionality of address generation and handling.

Regarding Claim 25,

Claim 25 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 8, in addition, Moore discloses that the network address generator is a server operating in accordance with a DHCP (Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol) protocol (Page 6, Paragraphs 63-66).

Regarding Claim 26,

Claim 26 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 10,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Moore discloses detecting a change of location of the network device within the distributed data processing system based on the geographic location information (Page 3, Paragraph 39).

Regarding Claim 27,

Claim 27 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 11,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 10, in addition, Moore discloses reconfiguring the network device based on the detected change of location of the network device (Page 3, Paragraph 39).

Regarding Claim 28,

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 11 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 12,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 10, in addition, Moore discloses reconfiguring user security parameters based on the detected change of location of the network device (Page 9, Paragraph 114).

Regarding Claim 29,

Claim 29 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 12 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Moore discloses representing the distributed data processing system as a set of scopes, wherein a scope comprises a logical organization of network-related objects (Pages 7-8, Paragraph 99);

Associating each scope with a management customer, wherein each scope is uniquely assigned to a management customer, wherein each scope is uniquely associated with a set of configuration parameters for managing each scope (Page 8, Paragraph 104); and

Managing the distributed data processing system as a set of logical networks, wherein a logical network comprises a set of scopes, and wherein each logical network is uniquely assigned to a management customer (Page 8, Paragraph 104); and

Allowing an administrative user to dynamically reconfigure logical networks within the distributed data processing system (Page 9, Paragraphs 110 and 114).

Regarding Claim 30,

Claim 30 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 13 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Stewart as modified by Moore discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Moore discloses dynamically discovering endpoints, systems,

and networks within the distributed data processing system (Page 8, Paragraphs 100 and 103);

Correspondingly representing endpoints, systems, and networks within the distributed data processing system as a set of endpoint objects, system objects, and network objects (Page 8, Paragraphs 100-103); and

Logically organizing the endpoint objects, system objects, and network objects within a set of scopes, wherein each endpoint object, each system object, and each network object is uniquely assigned to a scope such that scopes do not logically overlap (Page 8, Paragraphs 100-104).

Regarding Claim 31,

Claim 31 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 14 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER